

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action mailed on May 5, 2006, the Examiner took the following action: (1) rejected claims 1-15 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; (2) rejected claims 1-17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501), by Kerr (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2004/0088155), and further in view of Burg (U.S. Patent no. 6,362,840); and (3) rejected claims 18 – 25 as being unpatentable over Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501), and further in view of Burg (U.S. Patent no. 6,362,840). Applicants respectfully request entry of the amended claims and reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH**

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, states:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, “as failing to comply with the written description requirement,” that “the satellite assembly being configured to enable execution of a script embedded in a requested page” and “culture-dependent” were not “described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) ,

1 at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.”  
2 (Office Action p. 2, ¶ 3). Applicants have amended independent claims 1-25 to  
3 recite “the satellite assembly being configured to provide content to enable  
4 execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page” (Claim 1), “the  
5 satellite assembly providing the localized content to replace content on a requested  
6 page to enable a server to execute a script including the localized content  
7 embedded in the requested page” (Claim 10), and “a satellite assembly to provide  
8 a localized content associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the  
9 default culture, the satellite assembly being configured to provide the localized  
10 content to enable the computer to execute a script embedded in a requested page  
11 with the provided localized content” (Claim 18). Applicant respectfully submits  
12 that the amended claims comply with 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

13 As stated by the examiner in the response to the office action, applicants  
14 submit that their specification discloses server execution of scripts embedded in  
15 web pages (Page 4; lines 11-13). Further the specification states that the satellite  
16 assembly includes a DLL which contains localized content (page 7, lines 9-12;  
17 page 8, lines 2 - 5), and states that the server executes a script embedded on a web  
18 page, included in the requested web page with localized content (Page 7; lines 11-  
19 13, 20-21; page 9, 17-19) Applicants submit these amended claims comply with  
20 the written description requirement, and respectfully request reconsideration and  
21 withdrawal of the 112 second first paragraph rejection of claims 1-25.

#### 22 23 REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103(A)

24 Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over  
25 Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501), by Kerr (U.S. App. Pub. No.

1 US 2004/0088155), and further in view of Burg (U.S. Patent no. 6,362,840).

2 Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

3 As stated in Applicants response to the last office action, Applicants teach  
4 methods of providing localization of a web service with a server in response to a  
5 request. In one embodiment, a method comprises receiving a page request from a  
6 requester of the web service, and identifying a localization attribute in the page  
7 request. A culture associated with the page request is identified, and one or more  
8 values associated with the localization attribute are also identified. The method  
9 further includes referencing a satellite assembly (*e.g.* in one aspect, a dynamically  
10 linked library) (Specification, p. 7, lines 9-12) associated with the identified  
11 culture to locate an identifier associated with each value associated with the  
12 localization attribute. The satellite assembly may be configured to enable  
13 execution of a script embedded in a requested page. (Specification, p. 7, lines 9-  
14 12; p. 4, lines 11-13; p. 10, lines 14-16; p. 9, lines 17-19). In one particular  
15 embodiment, for example, the satellite assembly may be configured to follow  
16 Active Server Pages (ASP.NET) guidelines. (Specification, p. 10, lines 14-16).  
17 The method further includes replacing with the server references in the requested  
18 page to one or more attributes or values in the page request with content associated  
19 with the identifier located in the satellite assembly to provide a culture-dependent  
20 response, and transmitting the culture-dependent response to the requester of the  
21 web service.

22  
23 Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501)

24 As previously stated by Applicants in the prior response, Frerebeau  
25 describes localizing the content of a reference document 8 using a localization tool

1 11. The content is localized in the factory (p108), delivered to third parties so they  
2 can do it themselves (P109), or upon installation of the localization software (or  
3 "on the fly", e.g. when the JavaScript code is loaded and embedded on the web  
4 page) (para. 0110). Frerebeau, does not disclose or teach localizing the web page  
5 on the server using a requested web page.

6 As best shown in Figure 1 of Frerebeau, the localization tool 11 receives  
7 the reference document 8 and a translation file 10 and formulates a localized file  
8 13. According to Frerebeau, the translation file 10 constitutes the content model  
9 which specifies the positions of titles and paragraphs, indicates which information  
10 is to be provided, and which information is to be localized. (Para. 0085). Thus,  
11 Frerebeau teaches that the localization tool 11 produces the localized file 13 (e.g. a  
12 web page) from the reference file 8 and the translation file 10 by replacing the  
13 localization tags of the reference file 8 with the localized values of the identifiers  
14 given by the appropriate translation file 10. (Para. 0086).

15 Frerebeau does not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the methods and  
16 systems taught by Applicants. Specifically, Frerebeau fails to teach or fairly  
17 suggest *referencing a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture to*  
18 *locate an identifier associated with each value associated with the localization*  
19 *attribute, the satellite assembly being configured to provide content to enable*  
20 *execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page*, as recited in claim  
21 1 for example. As described in Applicants' detailed description, methods and  
22 systems of the invention may include a satellite assembly configured to provide  
23 substitutable text to enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a  
24 requested page (Specification, p. 4, lines 11-13; p. 10, lines 14-16; p. 8, lines 6-7;  
25 p. 9, lines 17-19). In one particular embodiment, the satellite assembly may be

1 configured to follow Active Server Pages (ASP.NET) guidelines. (Specification,  
2 p. 10, lines 14-16). This capability may be important, for example, for enabling  
3 server execution of scripts embedded in web pages. (Specification, p. 4, lines 11-  
4 13). There is no teaching or suggestion in Frerebeau of at least these aspects of  
5 Applicants' invention.

6  
7 Kerr (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2004/0088155)

8 Kerr likewise does not include the features of the claimed invention, nor  
9 would it be obvious to combine Kerr with Frerebeau. For example neither Kerr  
10 nor Frerebeau provide content that is to be executed by the server on a script in a  
11 requested webpage. Applicant hereby requests withdraw of the Kerr reference  
12 from the 103(a) rejection.

13  
14 Burg (U.S. Patent no. 6,362,840)

15 Burg describes method by a browser on a client computer that reads a  
16 received web page, and the browser executes the script in the received web page  
17 using a browser. The embedded script may include instructions that direct the  
18 browser to execute new objects, such as DLL's that are downloaded and stored for  
19 subsequent use (Column 10; lines 20 – 31). Burg does not disclose or teach having  
20 a satellite assembly being configured to provide text to enable execution by the  
21 server or a script embedded in a requested page.

22  
23 Claims 1-9

24 Turning now to the specific language of the claims, amended Claim 1  
25 recites

1 A method of providing localization of a web service, comprising:  
2 receiving a page request from a requester of the web service;  
3 identifying a localization attribute in the page request;  
4 identifying a culture associated with the page request;  
5 identifying one or more values associated with the localization  
6 attribute;

7 *referencing a satellite assembly associated with the identified  
8 culture to locate an identifier associated with each value associated with  
9 the localization attribute, the satellite assembly being configured to provide  
10 content to enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested  
11 page;*

12 replacing references in the requested page to one or more attributes  
13 or values in the page request with content associated with the identifier  
14 located in the satellite assembly to provide a culture-dependent response;  
15 and

16 transmitting the culture-dependent response to the requester of the  
17 web service. (emphasis added).

18 As described more fully above, neither Frerebeau, Kerr nor Berg disclose,  
19 teach, or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 1. Specifically, Frerebeau fails  
20 to teach or fairly suggest a method that includes “receiving a page request from a  
21 requester of the web service;” and “referencing a satellite assembly associated  
22 with the identified culture to locate an identifier associated with each value  
23 associated with the localization attribute, the satellite assembly being configured  
24 to provide text to enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested  
25 page” as recited in claim 1. The Office cites Frerebeau for referencing a satellite  
assembly associated with the identified culture to locate an identifier associated  
with each value associated with the localization attribute, however, there is no  
indication in Frerebeau of the satellite assembly being configured to provide text  
enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page as recited in  
claim 1. The office cites Berg for disclosing a browser that renders the web page  
and executes the embedded scrip instructions, or alternately, the embedded script

1 may instruct the [browser] to execute new objects such as DLL's that are  
2 downloaded; however, there is not indication in Berg of the satellite assembly  
3 being configure to provide to enable execution by a server.

4 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Frerebeau, Kerr and Berg for at  
5 least this reason. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least due to  
6 their dependency on claim 1, and also due to additional limitations recited in those  
7 claims.

8  
9 Claims 10-17

10 Similarly, claim 10 recites:

11 A computing-based system for providing localization of a web  
12 service, comprising:

13 a culture identification module configured to identify a culture  
associated with a page request;

14 a localization values parsing module configured to identify a  
15 localization attribute in the page request and identify localization attributes  
and localization values associated with the page request;

16 a key values parser configured to locate localized content associated  
17 with the localization attributes and localization values and to designate the  
localized content to replace content referenced by the localization attributes  
and localization values;

18 a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture that  
19 includes the localized content located by the key values parser, the satellite  
assembly *providing the localized content to replace content on a requested*  
20 *page to enable a server to execute a script including the localized content*  
embedded in the requested page; and

21 wherein the localized content is associated with the identified culture  
22 and is utilized when *the* requested page is served to an agent making the  
page request. (emphasis added).

23 As described more fully above, Frerebeau, Kerr and Berg do not disclose,  
24 teach, or fairly suggest the system recited in claim 10. Specifically, Frerebeau,  
25 Kerr and Berg fail to teach or fairly suggest a computing-based system that

includes "a satellite assembly *providing the localized content to replace content on a requested page* to enable a *server to execute a script including the localized content* embedded in *the requested page*" as recited in claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is not anticipated by Frerebeau. Claims 11-17 depend from claim 10 and are allowable at least due to their dependency on claim 10, and also due to additional limitations recited in those claims.

### Claims 18-25

Claim 18 recites:

One or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

- receiving a page request for web content for a preferred culture;
- identifying a requested culture from the page request;
- determining if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available;

- localizing the web content for the preferred culture if localized web content is available for the preferred culture; and

- localizing the web content for a default culture if localized web content is not available for the preferred culture, wherein at least one of localizing the web content for the preferred culture and localizing the web content for a default culture includes referencing a satellite assembly to *provide* a localized content associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the default culture, the satellite assembly being configured to *provide the localized content to enable the computer to execute a script embedded in a requested page with the provided localized content.* (emphasis added).

Again, as described more fully above, Frerebeau, and Burg do not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the computer-readable media recited in claim 18. Specifically, Frerebeau fails to teach or fairly suggest a computer-readable media that includes "referencing a satellite assembly to *provide* a localized content



1 associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the default culture, the  
2 satellite assembly being configured to *provide the localized content to enable the*  
3 *computer to execute* a script embedded in a requested page *with the provided*  
4 *localized content.*" as recited in claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is not unpatentable  
5 over Frerebeau in view of Burg. Further Burg is discusses running a script on a  
6 browser on a client, and not executing with a server a script on a requested web  
7 page to localize content. Claims 19-25 depend from claim 18 and are allowable at  
8 least due to their dependency on claim 18, and also due to additional limitations  
9 recited in those claims.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-25 and allowance of same. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11/3/2006

By:

Steven C. Stewart  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 33,555  
(206) 315-7909